

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed September 21, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 16-22, 24, 25, and 27-31 are now pending in this application. Claims 16-20, 24, 25, and 27-31 stand rejected. Claims 21, 22, and 32 stand objected to. Claims 1-15, 23, 26, and 32 have been canceled.

The rejection of Claims 16-22, 24, 25, and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed. Claims 16, 25, 28, and 30 have been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner at paragraph 4 of the Office Action. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejections of Claims 16-22, 24, 25, and 27-31 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 16, 19-22, 24, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. Claims 16 and 30 have been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner at paragraph 5 of the Office Action. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejections of Claims 16, 19-22, 24, and 30 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 16-19, 24, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,061,668 to Sharrow (hereinafter referred to as "Sharrow") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,890 to Elgamal et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Elgamal") and U.S. Patent No. 6,366,682 to Hoffman et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hoffman") is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 32 has been canceled and Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 32. Accordingly, Claim 16 is submitted to be patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal and Hoffman.

Claims 17-19 and 24 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 16. When the recitations of Claims 17-19 and 24 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 16, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 17-19 and 24 likewise are patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal and Hoffman.

Similarly, Claim 28, which includes limitations similar to those set forth in Claim 16, has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 32. Accordingly, Claim 28 is submitted to be patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal and Hoffman.

Claim 29 depends from independent Claim 28. When the recitations of Claim 29 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 28, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 29 likewise is patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal and Hoffman.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 16-19, 24, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 25, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and “Commercial Laundry Services”, available at <http://www.cinetworks.com/~jetz/comrcl.html> (hereinafter referred to as “Commercial Laundry Services”), is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25, which includes limitations similar to those set forth in Claim 16, has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 32. Accordingly, Claim 25 is submitted to be patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and Commercial Laundry Services.

Claim 27 depends from independent Claim 25. When the recitations of Claim 27 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 25, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 27 likewise is patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and Commercial Laundry Services.

Claim 30, which includes limitations similar to those set forth in Claim 16, has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 32. Accordingly, Claim 30 is submitted to be patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and Commercial Laundry Services.

Claim 31 depends from independent Claim 30. When the recitations of Claim 31 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 30, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 31 likewise is patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and Commercial Laundry Services.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 25, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and further in view of Kaufman (*Network Security: Private Communication in a Public World*) (hereinafter referred to as "Kaufman"), is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 depends indirectly from Claim 16, which Applicants believe is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. When the recitations of Claim 20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 16, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 20 likewise is patentable over Sharrow in view of Elgamal, Hoffman, and further in view of Kaufman.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070